United Nations A/C.1/53/PV.29

General Assembly
Fifty-third
First Committee
29th Meeting
Thursday, 12 November 1998, 3 p.m.
New York

Official Records

Chairman: Mr. Mernier ..... (Belgium)

The meeting was called to order at 3 p.m.

Agenda items 63 to 80 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all items

The Chairman: As was decided this morning, members now have the opportunity to make general statements on cluster 1, which includes draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. This afternoon we will consider A/C.1/53/L.22 and all the amendments to it.

Does any delegation wish to make a general statement on cluster 1?

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): On behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, I wish to comment briefly on that draft resolution, "Nuclear testing".

The objectives of the draft resolution are straightforward. Concerns surrounding nuclear-weapon tests in South Asia this year are of fundamental importance to the Committee. The tests were pernicious — no matter the justifications presented. They were conducted in defiance of an international norm opposed to nuclear testing. They will have a negative effect on future non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament endeavours.

We believe it is therefore appropriate and necessary that the Committee should address the issue. Throughout the year individual countries and many regional and political forums have spoken out against the tests. It is finally appropriate that this Committee of the General Assembly address this specific issue during the fifty-third session.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 speaks directly to nuclear-weapon tests in South Asia in May, to the international community's reaction — no more, no less. It deplores strongly the tests conducted in South Asia. It does not name the countries concerned. It does acknowledge prospective progress subsequently, including recent declarations made by the States concerned. It calls for commitments to be expressed in a legal form through signature and ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). In the view of the sponsors, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 is thus focused, credible and balanced. It does not establish new benchmarks. It is not discriminatory, based on earlier decisions taken by the Committee. It reflects the appropriate reaction of the international community to the testing that took place in May.

We are all aware that a small number of delegations would like to see draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 disappear. Some of those Member States have mounted a strong challenge to the First Committee's ability to take action on the draft resolution, proferring a raft of disparate amendments to the text. In our opinion, and in this particular context, these amendments ultimately divert focus away from the tests themselves. They raise issues dealt with fully in the other 20 nuclear draft resolutions also before the Committee. They serve to broaden and even destroy the simple, straightforward purpose of the draft resolution, whose purpose and message is, in itself, so important that it should not, and must not, be diluted or embellished.

We consider it is fundamental at this point in time that the international community have the opportunity to address

98-86400 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

the clear issue contained in the draft resolution. Most critically, the proposed amendments would deny us the opportunity to express our views on this issue.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 is the product of broad consultation by its sponsors. We understand from continuing consultations that it enjoys wide support across regional groups. In our considered view, it would be a serious mistake to revisit the text of the draft resolution. The most effective approach, we believe, is for the Committee to consider the draft resolution as it stands, without considering amendments. The sponsors will be calling for "no action" on each "L" document containing amendments. By supporting "no action" the Committee has a clear opportunity to protect the central message in the draft resolution and provide itself with the ability to take action on the draft resolution itself.

The sponsors renew the hope that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 will receive the widest possible support in the Committee, and that efforts to amend it will be opposed vigorously.

Mr. Izquierdo (Ecuador) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: My delegation wishes to speak with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing", and the package of amendments to it.

Ecuador decided to join in sponsoring the draft resolution because of our unequivocal, firm position of rejecting nuclear tests. None of us, no matter where we come from, have ever been selective regarding regions or countries. My country reacted immediately by deploring tests which took place in the past, and it did so again regarding the more recent tests, because they came after the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to which 187 States are party, and when the negotiations on the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty had concluded and it had already been signed by 150 countries. As a party to these international instruments, Ecuador expressed itself accordingly.

In addition to its individual statements, Ecuador subscribed to the declarations on nuclear testing adopted this year by, among others, the Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, the Organization of American States and the Rio Group. Our support for the draft resolution reflects exactly the positions adopted in those declarations.

My delegation would like to be perfectly clear. Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 refers to a specific subject. Therefore, we do not believe it would be wise to alter its essence with amendments which, on the one hand, refer to a variety of subjects and, on the other, would limit the scope of the draft resolution by seeking to change its purpose.

The subjects dealt with in the proposed amendments are important; my country would have no problem supporting many of them. In addition, they encompass principles that Ecuador has always defended. However, regrettably, we cannot support their adoption in this context, because they deal with matters far beyond the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. Furthermore, we believe that the texts of the amendments are already contained in other draft resolutions that have come before the First Committee.

Let me now make a brief marginal comment. It seems to my delegation that multilateral confrontation, which has been hinted at on occasion, has nothing to do with the matter under consideration. As far as my country is concerned, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 refers exclusively to the recent nuclear tests, and therefore has nothing to do with the friendly relations of cooperation and solidarity which Ecuador maintains with the countries of South Asia, whose social and economic ideals it shares. Nuclear aspirations are certainly not part of that common agenda.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to take this opportunity to respond to the statement by the representative of New Zealand and to take up a few of his assertions.

A central contradiction in the position of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and in their statements is that whereas the draft resolution is entitled "Nuclear testing" its contents are directed only at the nuclear tests conducted in South Asia. My delegation has stated before, and I repeat, that if it was the intention of the sponsors and other delegations to deal with the tests in South Asia and their implications, then they should have introduced a draft resolution which dealt with the nuclear and security aspects of the situation in South Asia. The First Committee could then have dealt with that situation in all its aspects and ramifications. I say this because nuclear tests do not arise out of a vacuum; they are a response to a security environment. The implications of the nuclear tests go far beyond a morality play on non-proliferation to questions of security, the political issues involved in South Asia and nuclear disarmament.

The sponsors of the draft resolution cannot, therefore, focus the draft resolution on nuclear testing and then limit it to South Asia. They have to do one or the other. If they wish to focus the draft resolution on what its title says — "Nuclear testing" — then they must refer to all nuclear testing. That testing has not taken place only in South Asia. I will share with my colleague from New Zealand — although I am sure I do not need to — the pamphlets issued by various non-governmental organizations describing the subcritical tests that have been conducted and those that are planned, as well as the fusion research and other laboratory simulation exercises that are going on, which are all classified as "nuclear testing".

Why does draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 not refer to these nuclear tests, which are designed to achieve the qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons? Is it because those tests are conducted by nuclear-weapon States? Is it because they are conducted by the allies of some of the principal sponsors of this draft resolution? Is it because they are conducted by people of the same race? What is the reason why those tests are not mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and why is it that the sponsors refuse to even entertain any amendments, modifications or reasonable adjustments to their text to make it more balanced and more consistent with the realities of life?

We of course respect New Zealand, because it is a country which has, as I said the other day, the courage of its convictions. It does not receive nuclear-armed ships in its ports, and that is a position of consistency. But, by the same token, I would say to my colleague from New Zealand that — with regard to the tests that took place in the Pacific in 1995 — Mururoa is much closer to New Zealand than South Asia is. Why was Mururoa not mentioned in 1995? Why was the South Pacific not mentioned? Is it not closer to New Zealand than South Asia? In this case New Zealand has co-sponsored a draft resolution that refers to South Asia, which is at a considerable distance from New Zealand.

We do not understand this kind of double standard. We would appeal to fair-minded people, like the delegation of New Zealand, to consider removing the discrimination in this draft resolution and support at least some of the amendments which seek to make it fair and equitable.

Mr. Cho (Republic of Korea): My delegation associates itself fully with the statement made by the representative of New Zealand on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, on nuclear testing. As one of the sponsors, we join him in appealing to the members of the First Committee to adopt draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 as it stands by an overwhelming majority.

As the Government of a country that has avowed a denuclearization policy voluntarily and unequivocally, my Government has attached particular importance to the global nuclear non-proliferation regime, and we have actively joined international efforts towards the strengthening of that regime.

In our view, the nuclear tests in South Asia last May dealt a serious blow to the recent progress in the development of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime through the indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). These tests seriously undermine the credibility and integrity of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime.

As we have indicated on many occasions, including my Foreign Minister's statement during the general debate of the General Assembly, we deeply regret these nuclear tests. We hope that the States concerned will desist from further nuclear testing, as they have indicated already, and accede to the NPT and the CTBT, which we believe are the main pillars of the nuclear non-proliferation regime.

In this regard, we believe that it is imperative that this Committee, and indeed the General Assembly, as a global institution representing the whole international community, should, by adopting draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 without amendment, send a clear and firm message that such challenges as posed by these nuclear tests cannot be condoned.

My delegation is convinced that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 is well crafted to reaffirm the international community's resolve towards the strengthening of the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and we believe that this draft resolution reflects a focused approach aimed at specifically addressing the dangerous ramifications of the nuclear testing in South Asia.

Lastly, my delegation would like also to underline that those addressed in this draft resolution might not be limited to the States concerned in South Asia but would be extended to other potential nuclear aspirants. Any misstep in this endeavour could send the wrong signal to those aspirants. We earnestly hope that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 will be adopted with overwhelming support without any amendments.

Mrs. Kunadi (India): My delegation has requested the floor to present its position with regard to the draft resolution entitled "Nuclear testing", contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22.

Following the tests in May, my Government announced a voluntary moratorium on nuclear tests. The Prime Minister of India, speaking before the General Assembly on 24 September, stated that India was willing to move towards a de jure formalization of this obligation. In announcing a moratorium, India has already accepted the basic obligation of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

We have taken note of the statement just made by the Ambassador of New Zealand on behalf of the co-sponsors. We believe that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22 is coercive and attempts to pressure my country to deflect it from the direction towards which India has already declared its intention to move.

India has done everything possible to reconcile its own security needs with the general wish of the international community to see an end to nuclear testing. The way forward should be to work together. Recriminations or attempts to isolate any countries, such as through this draft resolution, do not help.

Its title notwithstanding, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22 does not address the broad issues of nuclear testing but focuses only on the tests conducted in May this year. We may recall that since the dawn of the nuclear age there have been more than 2,000 nuclear tests. This is the first time that this Committee has been asked to approve a draft resolution which is discriminatory in its approach. Its objective is not to treat all relevant aspects of nuclear testing but to isolate the two countries — India and Pakistan.

While the draft does not address nuclear testing as a whole, it attempts to go far beyond the subject by drawing in references to Security Council resolution 1172 (1998), which addressed issues that had nothing to do with nuclear tests. Besides, Security Council resolution 1172 (1998) was tendentious in its intentions and discriminatory in its perspective and, contrary to the provisions of the Charter, was adopted without giving India an opportunity to participate in the Council's discussions.

India has raised a number of queries regarding this resolution which remain unanswered to this day. In an effort to bring the text of the draft resolution into line with the generally accepted principles on nuclear testing that the General Assembly has on previous occasions adopted — including in resolution 50/70 A on nuclear testing, adopted in 1995 — we have proposed amendments which have been tabled as "L" documents. These amendments attempt to bring balance to an otherwise discriminatory and self-serving draft resolution. We have been told that no amendments were proposed in 1995, but then no amendments were probably necessary, as there were consultations among concerned delegations. The co-sponsors of this draft resolution have made no attempt to seek the views of the parties affected most by this draft resolution. We feel that it has been presented to this Committee on a take-it-or-leave-it basis, in much the same manner as Security Council resolution 1172 (1998).

We are not the only country to have proposed amendments. So too have other countries, including members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), Pakistan, Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Zambia. We believe that these amendments deserve to be seriously considered and that the General Assembly, through the First Committee, of course, must be given an opportunity to discuss and evaluate the amendments.

We also believe that A/C.1/53/L.22 does not go far enough in making explicit and direct the relationship between the cessation of nuclear testing and nuclear disarmament. The negotiations on the CTBT began in 1993 with the mandate that such a treaty would contribute effectively to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects, to the process of nuclear disarmament and therefore to the enhancement of international peace and security.

India participated actively in these negotiations and sought to place the Treaty in a disarmament framework by proposing its linkage with a time-bound programme for the universal elimination of all nuclear weapons. This Committee is aware that India's proposals were not accepted, including by the delegations which have sponsored this draft resolution.

The draft resolution refers to alarm expressed internationally, regionally and nationally at recent nuclear tests. Several countries, spread across the political and geographical spectrum, have expressed understanding of the circumstances and context of the nuclear tests. Distinguished institutions and individuals, several of them from the countries which have co-sponsored this draft resolution, have seen the recent events as a wake-up call for nuclear disarmament. The Durban Summit of heads of

State or Government of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement noted the complexities arising from the nuclear tests in South Asia, which underline the need to work even harder to achieve global disarmament objectives, including the elimination of nuclear weapons.

A letter from the sponsors of this draft resolution made available to delegations today does not mention the Non-Aligned Movement Durban Declaration nor the position taken by the SAARC Summit in Colombo, or other meetings which adopted a more balanced approach. Since this draft resolution refers to nuclear testing, we believe that it should express concern at reports of continuing qualitative development of nuclear weapons by certain nuclear-weapon States, in contravention of the purposes and objectives of the CTBT.

Concerns regarding qualitative development of nuclear weapons have been widely shared, even by the European Parliament. If we are to talk of norms, then the norm of the prohibition of the use of nuclear weapons exists in the United Nations Charter and in international humanitarian law, and is also contained in the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legality of the use of nuclear weapons. Some of the sponsors of this draft resolution are themselves beneficiaries of alliances or security arrangements. Of these, two are members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), whose strategic doctrine continues to be predicated not only on the possession, but also on the first use, of nuclear weapons. A third sponsor is a member of another security arrangement, under which it enjoys the protection of a nuclear umbrella. It is quite extraordinary that countries that continue to predicate their security on nuclear weapons as completely as those countries do should propose a draft resolution in the Committee seeking to criticize nuclear tests carried out by other countries. Doubie standards are much in evidence.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to state clearly that a draft resolution on nuclear testing that is discriminatory and moulded in a coercive manner will be counter-productive and inevitably impact negatively on the forthcoming disarmament agenda. We trust that the large majority of delegations will resist discriminatory and coercive approaches and lend their support to those amendments that bring fairness, balance and perspective to this draft resolution.

Mr. De Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation has very carefully studied draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22,which proposes that the General Assembly express its grave concern over and strongly deplore the recent nuclear tests conducted in South Asia. We have studied equally carefully the proposed amendments.

Mexico's opposition to all testing of nuclear weapons has been constant and invariable. We believe that the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects is indispensable if we are to achieve a world free of these potentially catastrophic weapons.

In May this year the Government of Mexico condemned and deplored the nuclear-weapon tests conducted at that time, saying that

> "nuclear testing undermines and endangers the international non-proliferation regime regarding these weapons, which is indispensable to world peace and security, since the risk of their being used increases in direct proportion to their propagation, accumulation and technological development."

In the same statement, Mexico appealed to all States to immediately halt all aspects of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and to initiate urgent negotiations on an unequivocal, binding commitment to completely eliminate nuclear weapons.

My delegation believes that the General Assembly, as it has done in past years when other States have carried out tests involving nuclear explosions, must take a stand on the tests conducted in South Asia last May, and it must recognize the serious concern and disapproval expressed by the majority of the international community at the international, regional and national levels. That is why my delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

As regards the proposed amendments, my delegation will vote against those that undermine the purpose of the draft resolution, which is simply to deplore the nuclear tests conducted in May this year.

In keeping with our well-known position and with the contents of my Government's communiqués last May, my delegation will vote in favour of those amendments that, without undermining the purposes of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, appeal for the cessation of nuclear-weapons proliferation in all its aspects and for the achievement of a world free of nuclear weapons.

Furthermore, we have learned that certain procedural motions may be put forward with the goal of avoiding consideration of amendments to draft resolution

A/C.1/53/L.22. If this is so, the delegation of Mexico will vote in favour of motions to take no action on those amendments whose objective it is to undermine the specific purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 — namely, those amendments designed to exclude or dilute the expression of the international community's concern regarding the nuclear tests conducted in South Asia.

We will abstain on no-action motions with regard to amendments that, without undermining the direct purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, seek to include in the draft resolution the need to halt all nuclear tests or to make progress in the nuclear disarmament process. This is because, although we agree with the contents of these amendments, and if they are put to a vote we will vote in favour of them, these matters are already dealt with in other draft resolutions on which the General Assembly will take action.

Mr. Hayashi (Japan): The basic position of Japan on the issue of nuclear weapons has already been expressed in my statement during the general debate and also in my explanations of vote on several draft resolutions. Therefore, it is already well known to the members of the First Committee, and I will not repeat it.

On this occasion I would like to explain Japan's position on nuclear testing. Japan has opposed all nuclear test explosions, and it has made this position very clear whenever such explosions have taken place. As for the nuclear tests conducted in South Asia in May this year, Japan immediately issued a statement strongly deploring them, because Japan considers that no nuclear tests should be conducted and because those tests constituted a challenge to the international community's nuclear non-proliferation efforts. Japan indeed took these tests very seriously and acted accordingly.

Japan is of the view that the First Committee, which deals with security and disarmament issues, is simply being legitimate and logical in trying to express, by means of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, its view on the nuclear tests in question. The draft resolution focuses on the nuclear tests conducted in South Asia in May this year, and it does so rightly because those tests are particularly relevant to the work of the First Committee this year and because other draft resolutions focusing on other nuclear-disarmament and non-proliferation issues are being put forward.

Japan therefore strongly supports draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 as it is. Japan believes that it contains the message that the First Committee should send to the world this year.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Let me take this opportunity, as we are ending the debate on cluster 1, to say a few words about the draft resolution in document A/C.1/53/L.22 and the issue of nuclear tests which have been conducted in South Asia and elsewhere this year.

Canada and some other delegations —

The Chairman: My understanding was that this morning we had an agreement that there would be only one general statement per delegation. That was the decision of the Committee, as far as I know.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Earlier I had sent a colleague to the Secretary of the Committee to say that I would like to speak in exercise of the right of reply to respond to the delegation of New Zealand. I was given the floor, and I responded to the delegation of New Zealand. That was in exercise of my right of reply. This is my statement. I did not read my statement.

The Chairman: Mr. Ambassador, when you made your statement, you did not qualify it as a right of reply — at least, not to me.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I specifically stated — as the record will show — that I had asked for the floor to respond to my colleague, the Ambassador of New Zealand.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to make his general statement. However, I would remind him that rights of reply are exercised at the end of the day.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): If that is so, I would have been grateful to be advised by the secretariat that I should exercise that right at the end of the day, but I think that I should not have to pay the consequences for confusion elsewhere.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): All members of the Committee, including the representative of Pakistan, have been informed that rights of reply are exercised at the end of the day.

In any event, I give the representative of Pakistan the floor to make his general statement.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I am most grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the secretariat.

Canada and some other delegations have submitted a draft resolution on nuclear testing contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22. Pakistan considers that draft resolution to be discriminatory and unfair, and we believe that the consequences of the debate on it will be entirely contrary to the high objectives which have been enumerated by its principal sponsors.

Pakistan has explained its position regarding the nuclear tests which we were compelled to conduct on 28 and 30 May 1998, in response to the tests which were conducted on 11 and 13 May.

The following facts should be borne in mind by all those who seek to pass judgement on our tests. First, we acted in self-defence under Article 51 of the United Nations Charter to avert the danger of the possible use of force and in the face of overt threats.

Secondly, Pakistan did not violate any international law or treaty. We are not a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), nor have we signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). We did not sign the CTBT precisely because we feared that there would be tests in our region. Immediately after the tests we initiated moves to preserve regional stability and to prevent the proliferation impact of the Indo-Pakistani tests.

Pakistan has been responsive to the concerns of the international community. We have declared a moratorium. We have agreed to the commencement of fissile material negotiations in Geneva. We have affirmed our policy of not exporting sensitive technologies, and we have proposed a strategic restraint regime in South Asia. We have entered into a dialogue with one major Power, and we have commenced a dialogue with our neighbour, India, on peace and security.

The draft resolution is backward-looking. It does not take into account the positive developments to which I have referred which have taken place since May in South Asia. It does not take into account the important statement made by my Prime Minister in the General Assembly. And, what is more, such reference as is made to that move denigrates it, in operative paragraph 2.

The draft resolution will strengthen the endeavours of some nuclear-weapon States to focus attention only on non-proliferation issues and divert attention from the greater threat which is posed by the possession of nuclear weapons by these States, and by the doctrine that would enable them to use such nuclear weapons. Any pronouncement on South Asian nuclear testing must be accompanied by a call for nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons immediately or within a specified period of time. Any resolution adopted by the General Assembly on South Asian testing should be balanced, non-discriminatory, constructive and forward-looking.

In the context of the South Asian tests, the non-aligned countries were able to achieve a consensus at the Durban Summit. The Non-Aligned Movement summit, *inter alia*, expressed opposition to unilateral, coercive and discriminatory measures taken by some major Powers in the name of averting the proliferation of nuclear weapons. The non-aligned countries also called for nuclear disarmament and the elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified period of time.

The amendments put forward by my delegation, and by some other delegations, are designed to introduce balance into the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22. We are most concerned that this draft resolution refers to the coercive and unilateral Security Council resolution 1172 (1998). It does not mention the subcritical and laboratory tests being conducted by some nuclear-weapon States. It does not call for nuclear disarmament, which is the objective of ending nuclear testing.

The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 have declared their unwillingness to consider any amendment to it. They have also indicated their intention to propose no-action motions. This is an unusual procedure for the First Committee. It reflects inflexibility — indeed, arrogance. We appeal for these no-action motions to be strongly opposed.

We call for support for the amendment submitted by Sri Lanka, on behalf of States members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52, which would delete reference to the unilateral and coercive Security Council resolution 1172 (1998) and refer instead to all previous United Nations resolutions on nuclear testing. It would also deplore all nuclear tests, whatever their purpose, not only the South Asian tests.

The amendment proposed by Pakistan in document A/C.1/53/L.56 would strongly deplore nuclear testing and

experiments for the qualitative development of nuclear weapons and call for the immediate withdrawal of all unilateral, coercive and discriminatory measures, in accordance with the language of the Durban communiqué.

The amendment submitted jointly by Pakistan and India in document A/C.1/53/L.61 would welcome the moratoria on further testing and the statements of their Prime Ministers in the General Assembly relating to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). The amendment would also call on all States, not only Pakistan and India, listed in annex 2 of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty to become parties to the Treaty —

The Chairman: Mr. Ambassador, you have one minute left.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The amendment proposed by Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe in document A/C.1/53/L.62 would seek to add a new paragraph urging the five nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their commitments relating to nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), with the ultimate objective of eliminating those weapons. This language, I believe, was also approved by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) General Conference in October 1998 on a similar Western resolution dealing with nuclear testing.

In conclusion, my delegation would urge all fair-minded delegations, including those of our friends who have chosen to sponsor the draft resolution, to support the proposed amendments. Their concern about nuclear testing is understandable, but their concern for equity and fair-mindedness should also be evident in their positions, as expressed in this Committee.

The Chairman: I have to draw the attention of the representative of Pakistan to the fact that he has already exercised his right of reply once. He knows the rules about rights of reply.

I call on the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like the Legal Counsel or whoever is here to advise on how many rights of reply a delegation may exercise, because I understand that a statement in exercise of the right of reply can be made against any individual statement that is addressed to a particular country. Therefore, if some other delegation should refer to my country, I would have the right to reply once again. I would like clarification of this rule.

The Chairman: At the end of the day.

I call on the representative of Canada.

Mr. Moher (Canada): I have just two or three very quick points.

First, we exercised forbearance and did not ask to speak on a point of order because we did not want to interrupt our colleague from Pakistan. I said this morning that Canada would not engage in polemics on and around this draft resolution and we will maintain that position. I do wish, however, to make it categorically clear to every delegation and individual present that my country and my Government do not act on the basis of racism.

With regard to procedure, may I ask you, Mr. Chairman, to ensure that we all understand what your position is and that that position will be enforced. Various techniques — we all know this — can be used to circumvent the recommendation that you put before us this morning: multiple introductions of amendments, rights of reply and points of order. We all know the games that can be played. I would like very much to make sure that we understand the rules that you, Sir, wish us to abide by. We, for one, will certainly abide fully by your ruling.

The Chairman: I shall call on those remaining speakers wishing to make general statements and then I will answer the question put by the representative of Canada.

Mr. Felicio (Brazil): I will make a very brief statement. I asked for the floor to announce that Brazil will vote in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing", as proposed by the sponsors.

As for the proposed amendments, my delegation will abstain in the voting on all of them, although we share many of the principles expressed therein. These amendments, if adopted, would change the main focus of the draft resolution. Moreover, we are of the view that most of the proposals reflected in the amendments are already covered by other draft resolutions that we support.

Mr. Fruchtbaum (Solomon Islands): I take the floor on a point of personal privilege, if you will allow it, Sir.

In his most recent comments, the representative of Pakistan referred to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, among which the Solomon Islands is proud to be included, as showing arrogance. Hence we are arrogant, I take that to mean. Frankly, I resent that remark. Earlier this afternoon, he was less than kind to you, Sir, and this morning, on two separate occasions, he was insulting to the representative of Canada. We have a long and difficult procedure ahead of us, and I humbly request that the representative of Pakistan please not engage in that kind of remark.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I wish to recall that rights of reply should be exercised at the end of the day.

I call on the representative of Pakistan on a point of order.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to inquire from you, Sir, and from the secretariat as to the nature of the two interventions we have just heard. Were these points of order, rights of reply, or what?

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I believe that the representative of Pakistan himself exercised his right of reply at a moment that was not entirely appropriate. I should like this kind of discussion to cease.

Does any other delegation wish to make a general statement?

Mrs. Castro de Barish (Costa Rica) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to make a comment on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, on nuclear testing.

Whenever this matter has arisen in this Committee over the years, we have always been openly and resolutely opposed to all nuclear testing, wherever it may have taken place. We believe that draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 pursues a clear objective regarding nuclear testing in South Asia. The text should be maintained as a whole and should not be undermined by amendments. True, some of these amendments contain important elements, but, as has already been mentioned, those elements have been adopted in other contexts.

As a member-elect of the Security Council, my delegation supports Security Council resolution 1172 (1998), adopted unanimously on 6 June 1998. It refers to the problem we are addressing here. My delegation therefore sincerely hopes that the text of the draft resolution will be maintained in the form in which it was submitted.

Mr. Grey (United States of America): My delegation supports draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 as tabled and without amendments. In our view, the draft resolution merits the full support of us all. It is simple, straightforward, non-confrontational and forward-looking.

The draft resolution is simple because it focuses on one issue: nuclear testing in South Asia. Twenty other draft resolutions before this Committee address the range of other nuclear issues. It is straightforward because it addresses a deep-seated worldwide shared concern. It is not confrontational because it does not single out for criticism any specific country by name, nor does it make any demands.

The text does not fail to take developments since August 1998 into account. In operative paragraph 2, the draft resolution takes note of the testing moratoria declared by the States concerned as well as their willingness to enter into legal commitments not to conduct any further tests. It is also forward-looking in that it calls for the States concerned to sign and ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, a Treaty that 151 States have signed and 21 have ratified.

My delegation will support no-action motions on all amendments and should these fail we will oppose on principle all amendments, whatever their content. The aim of the amendments is transparent: to kill the draft resolution by converting it into something else and by causing a new debate over the scope of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty or by equating the nuclear tests in South Asia with previous tests over the years. These amendments would transform this draft resolution into one essentially similar to several other draft resolutions already adopted.

The First Committee is the one forum on arms control and disarmament in which almost all of the nations of the world are represented. We should stand together against efforts to frustrate the clear desire of the international community to express intense concern about nuclear testing in South Asia. That is the point of the draft resolution, and the First Committee should not allow itself to be distracted by attempts to evade it.

Mr. Kunda (Zambia): Before we broke off this morning we had decided that there should be general statements on cluster 1, followed by general statements on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, and that there would be

introductions of the various amendments. Are we to have the introductions before the general statements on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22?

The Chairman: This morning we decided that we would have general statements in general, not qualifying them as relating to the cluster or to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, as there is only this draft resolution in this cluster before the Committee today. Then we decided that there would be an opportunity for those who have proposed amendments to introduce them. Then we would consider the amendments in the chronological order of their presentation to the Committee.

Mr. Kunda (Zambia): I wish to speak on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing", as representative of a delegation that has, together with the delegations of Nigeria and Zimbabwe, put forward an amendment. That amendment, contained in document A/C.1/53/L.62, proposes a new operative paragraph 4, which reads:

> "*Urges* the five nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their commitments relating to nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to intensify their efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate objective of eliminating those weapons in accordance with that article."

My delegation subscribes to this amendment in the belief that it would enrich the draft resolution by lending it some balance. We also believe that nuclear-weapon testing is the engine that feeds qualitative nuclear-weapon development, and that the five nuclear-weapon States that have conducted more than 2,000 nuclear-weapon tests since the dawn of the nuclear age ought to be urged to fulfil their obligations relative to nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT).

The language is from an International Atomic Energy Agency document, and therefore we did not foresee any problem for the sponsors in embracing this straightforward amendment. Regrettably, they have served notice that they will not entertain any amendment. The reasons they advance for not accepting amendments include their wanting the draft resolution to remain focused. But this focus is not on nuclear-weapon testing, in our view. Rather, it is on the two countries of South Asia — India and Pakistan — that conducted nuclear-weapon tests last May. This focus is discriminatory. If the draft resolution has to focus on nuclear testing, it should also address nuclear tests through computer simulations which are being conducted by some nuclear-weapon States now.

The sponsors also argue that although article VI of the NPT has been referred to in a number of other draft resolutions already, it should not be mentioned in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. We felt that since reference to article VI of the NPT has appeared in other draft resolutions, and to our knowledge has encountered no rejection, that is all the more reason why it should be embraced in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 as well.

As one of the sponsors of the amendment, my delegation is disappointed that it is rejected. In these circumstances, my delegation will find it extremely difficult to support the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22.

Having said that, let me hasten to point out that Zambia fully supports the total ban on all nuclear-weapon testing in all environments by any country or group of countries. It is in this spirit that my country subscribed to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty when it was adopted by the General Assembly a few years ago. My delegation at that time regretted the fact that the CTBT was not so comprehensive because it did not cover all environments, including computers.

Mrs. Martinic (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to make the following statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing".

The amendments presented are far removed from the objective of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 — to express concern over and deplore the recent nuclear tests in South Asia — because they deal with more general matters connected with the achievement of nuclear disarmament.

Although the goal of nuclear disarmament is legitimate, it is dealt with in other draft resolutions on that specific subject presented during this session. Regardless of the merits of the amendments in another context, their incorporation in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 would undermine the nature of the draft. Therefore, the delegation of Argentina will vote against these amendments.

Mr. Mesdoua (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing".

Algeria attaches great importance to nuclear disarmament, which must remain the absolute priority of the international community in the area of disarmament. That is why we have shared our concern about all nuclear testing, including the recent tests in South Asia, which no argument, including nuclear deterrence, can justify. The possession of nuclear weapons, as well as their simulation in laboratories, must be banned in order to achieve collective security.

Having said that, my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, for the following reasons. First, its reference to Security Council resolution 1172 (1998), adopted on 6 June, condemning the nuclear tests in South Asia, does not seem to us to be appropriate. Secondly, the geographical reference to the South Asia region also seems inappropriate. Finally, the moratorium declared by India and Pakistan, as well as their intention to join the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty should, from our point of view, be encouraged and supported.

My delegation would have had no problem over supporting a text whose language was identical to that of resolution 50/70 A, adopted by the General Assembly in 1995. Up to the last moment, my delegation, which supported the intensive consultations held in the last few days between several delegations interested in this question to reach wording acceptable to all, had hoped that those consultations would be successful.

For all those reasons, my delegation cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, nor can it, on principle, support any no-action motion, which we consider undemocratic. On the other hand, depending on the results of the no-action motion, we will consider supporting the amendments according to their individual merits.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to make a general statement, we will move to the second phase of our proceedings: the introduction of amendments. I would ask those who have submitted amendments to introduce them in the order of submission.

I call first on Sri Lanka.

Mr. Bjarme (Sri Lanka): The amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.52, proposed by Sri Lanka on behalf of the seven member countries of the South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation, was introduced by Sri Lanka's Ambassador during a previous meeting of the Committee. We do not intend to speak to the amendment once again, as it has been put before the Committee.

The Chairman: The next amendment has been introduced by India. Does India wish to speak to it again?

Mrs. Kunadi (India): India has indeed introduced amendments, and these are contained in documents A/C.1/53/L.55, L.57 and L.58. I would like to have the opportunity to take the floor when they are taken up for a decision.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I would like the representative of India to speak to the amendment now, before we conclude this stage of our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. When we enter the decision-making process, there will be opportunities for statements in explanation of vote both before and after the vote, as usual.

Mrs. Kunadi (India): The amendment proposed by India in document A/C.1/53/L.55 relates to the first preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, which we would like to be modified to read:

> "*Reaffirming* that the cessation of all nuclear testing will contribute to the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons in all its aspects, to the process of nuclear disarmament leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time and therefore to the further enhancement of international peace and security".

India has already stood for nuclear disarmament and the complete elimination of nuclear weapons within a specified framework of time. This is a principle which has been accepted by the Non-Aligned Movement and in the proposals which India along with a group of countries, the Group of 21, has submitted to the Conference on Disarmament. We would hope and expect that this amendment proposed by India would receive the Committee's support.

Our next amendment is in document A/C.1/53/L.57. Here we have proposed that the second preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 should read as follows:

> "*Also reaffirming* its commitment to the crucial importance of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty to international efforts to halt the proliferation of nuclear weapons through nuclear testing".

The third set of amendments proposed by India is contained in document A/C.1/53/L.58. We suggest that the existing formulation in paragraph 2,

> "reiterates the need for such legal commitments to be expressed in legal form by signing and ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty"

should be replaced by

> "calls upon all States that have not yet done so to become parties to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty so as to facilitate its entry into force by September 1999".

The Chairman: The next amendments, to be introduced by the Ambassador of Pakistan, are in document A/C.1/53/L.56.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The amendments contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56 address two issues in the context of nuclear testing which are omitted from draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. The first important omission from that draft resolution, which is entitled "Nuclear testing", is that it does not in any way express concern about the nuclear testing and experiments which are taking place for the qualitative development of nuclear weapons by certain nuclear-weapon States, contrary to the objectives of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.

In this context, I should like to draw the Committee's attention to a study entitled "Dangerous Thermonuclear Quest". It is about the fusion research planned for a $2.2 billion facility which would help scientists design new nuclear weapons and which could lead to the development of pure fusion weapons. The authors of this study, Arjun Makhijani and Hisham Zerriffi, say that the development of new nuclear designs is contrary to the purposes of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), which, as the preamble states, include

> "constraining the development and qualitative improvement of nuclear weapons and ending the development of ... new types of nuclear weapons".

The authors state that experiments at the National Ignition Facility will include minute thermonuclear explosions. The CTBT prohibits all nuclear explosions, no matter how small.

There is another report, which refers to the exercise called "Bagpipe", under which one nuclear-weapon State has conducted subcritical testing.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The representative of Pakistan is introducing an amendment. I must ask him not to take this opportunity to make a general statement.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I kindly request you, Sir, to allow me the opportunity at least to explain the amendment. My amendment relates to testing in the laboratory. I am trying to apprise the membership of the Committee of the fact that such testing is taking place, which explains the nature of the amendment contained in A/C.1/53/L.56. I know it must be annoying to you, Sir, because you have a very difficult task ahead of you. But please be fair and allow us to explain our point of view.

The Chairman: I am fair; try to be brief.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): To sum up, I would draw the attention of members to those studies. I have excerpts with me; I can share them with any delegations that are interested in objectivity and the facts. That is why we believe that the draft resolution must also refer to such testing, and not only to the South Asian nuclear test explosions.

Furthermore, certain States have been subjected to unilateral, coercive and discriminatory measures in the promotion of the objectives of non-testing and non-proliferation. The Final Document of the Non-Aligned Movement summit meeting in Durban states that the heads of State or Government

> "also stressed their positions against unilateral, coercive or discriminatory measures which have been applied against Non-Aligned countries."

This amendment seeks to reflect that position of the non-aligned countries, and we urge that the amendment be supported by the largest possible majority of countries in this Committee.

The Chairman: Pakistan and India have also submitted the amendments in document A/C.1/53/L.61. I give the floor to the representative of Pakistan to introduce the amendments.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): On behalf of the delegation of India and of my own delegation, I would like to introduce

the amendments contained in document A/C.1/53/L.61, which deal with paragraph 2 of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22.

Paragraph 2 of the draft resolution notes the moratoria that have been declared by India and Pakistan and then goes on to urge them to adhere to the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). It is our view that the draft resolution should at least reflect what has been stated in the General Assembly and in the First Committee by many delegations, which is that many delegations have welcomed the moratoria that have been declared on further testing by the States in South Asia. Moreover, many statements have noted with appreciation or have welcomed the statements relating to the CTBT made by the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and India in the General Assembly. The first amendment would seek to reflect that factual situation in paragraph 2 of the draft resolution.

Furthermore, we do not see why paragraph 2 should ask only the States concerned — the States in South Asia — to ratify or adhere to the CTBT. The CTBT would come into force if all 44 States listed in annex 2 of the Treaty ratified the Treaty. In any draft resolution it would be unfair and discriminatory to ask only two States to do so. Therefore, the second amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.61 calls on all States that have not done so, specially those listed in annex 2 of the CTBT, to become parties to the Treaty. We believe that both the amendments are not only factual but fair, and we seek the support of the Committee for their adoption.

The Chairman: The last amendment to the draft resolution is in document A/C.1/53/L.62. I give the floor to the representative of Zimbabwe to introduce the amendment.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): I have the honour to introduce the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.62, which

> "*Urges* the five nuclear-weapon States to fulfil their commitments relating to nuclear disarmament under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and to intensify their efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate objective of eliminating those weapons in accordance with that article."

It is evident that my delegation does not support the no-action motion of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. On the contrary, Zimbabwe has co-sponsored the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.62, one of the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. My delegation would like to take this opportunity to explain why we feel that the inclusion of this amendment, sponsored by Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe, would lend weight and meaning to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, on nuclear testing, under consideration today.

May I proceed with my explanation, Sir? I ask because when the leader of the Pakistani delegation made a statement to introduce one of the amendments there was confusion as to whether he was making a general statement or introducing the amendment.

The Chairman: We are now in the phase of introducing draft resolutions and amendments. The phase of general statements is past.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): I shall now proceed to explain the reason for the draft amendment.

Let me state from the outset that Zimbabwe, a State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), is committed to the goal of global nuclear disarmament and, like the rest of the international community, is opposed to nuclear testing, whether for the acquisition of nuclear weapons or for their qualitative improvement.

Nuclear testing and nuclear disarmament are interrelated and inseparable issues. The non-existence of nuclear testing cannot be an end in itself. It should be a step towards nuclear disarmament. Some nuclear-weapon States recognize this, and in this connection I wish to quote from a statement by His Excellency Mr. Lin Changhe, Ambassador for Disarmament Affairs of the People's Republic of China, at the fifth meeting of the First Committee, on 14 October.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I would ask the representative of Zimbabwe to end his statement with the introduction of the amendment; it is my opinion that he has gone beyond the introduction of the amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not accept that I have gone beyond introducing the amendment. First, I have stated that I wish to explain the rationale behind the amendment. Secondly, I happen to know that when a Member State is speaking on behalf of other Member States it is usually allotted more time than normal.

The Chairman: Please finish your statement as soon as possible.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council and one of the nuclear Powers. Mr. Li Changhe stated:

> "The complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons is the common aspiration of mankind. We fully understand the wish of the large number of non-nuclear-weapon States for general and complete nuclear disarmament and their concern over the slow pace of this process. The indefinite extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) does not imply that the nuclear-weapon States can possess nuclear weapons for ever. The nuclear-weapon States should intensify their efforts to fulfil the obligations set forth in article VI of the NPT." (*A/C.1/53/PV.5, p. 63*)

Therefore, it is the considered view of my delegation that the recent nuclear tests conducted in South Asia, which my country deplored, are the result of the existence of a nuclear club of States bent on preserving their nuclear monopoly while pontificating to the other States of the world that they should not acquire the same weaponry. My delegation does not believe that a group of nuclear-weapon States should claim the moral high ground, claiming that those weapons are in safe and civilized hands while the rest of the world cannot be trusted with them.

My country acceded to the NPT and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) on the understanding that, and in the hope that, these two Treaties were not an end in themselves but part of a process leading towards total nuclear disarmament. This is why my country is co-sponsoring an amendment to reflect the nuclear disarmament goal enshrined in article VI of the NPT.

The 113-member Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, when it met at Cartagena and at Durban, condemned nuclear testing but proceeded to stress the need for nuclear disarmament. The Non-Aligned Movement position is also the African position — that an end to nuclear testing must lead to nuclear disarmament.

I had intended to read out another quotation, but since I see that there is growing impatience, I will not do so. I was going to quote the Canberra Commission, a highly esteemed and respected body, which stated —

The Chairman: Canberra is quite far away from the amendment.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): The Canberra Commission said, in the Statement section of its report:

> "Nuclear weapons are held by a handful of states which insist that these weapons provide unique security benefits, and yet reserve uniquely to themselves the right to own them. This situation is highly discriminatory and thus unstable; it cannot be sustained. The possession of nuclear weapons by any state is a constant stimulus to other states to acquire them."

Hence we condemn all forms of nuclear testing and urge all States to refrain from nuclear testing.

I shall not at this stage quote the delegation of the United States. I refer here to Ambassador Holum, who stated — and I quote —

The Chairman: Mr. Ambassador, you have largely passed the five minutes of a general statement, so I ask you to spare us a quotation from Ambassador Holum.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): I would just say that the quotation from the Ambassador of the United States was exactly in the same vein as that from the representative of China. If the United States, a nuclear-weapon State, like China, is committed to fulfilling its obligations under article VI of the NPT, why would the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 — namely, Australia, Canada and New Zealand, non-nuclear-weapon States themselves — oppose the inclusion of the amendment proposed by Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe?

The Chairman: Thirty seconds.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, these are the reasons why we do not support the no-action motion with respect to this draft, and why Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe are sponsoring the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.62 to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, the amendment which I have had the honour to introduce.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): All the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 have now been introduced. We will take them up in the order I proposed this morning, that is, the order in which they were introduced.

We begin with amendment A/C.1/53/L.52, "Sri Lanka: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Zimonyi (Hungary): My delegation wishes to move a motion of no action on the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52. As one of the sponsors, we attach great importance to preserving the integrity of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and keeping its focus on the subject matter it intends to address.

The Chairman: We are now in a procedure in which two countries may speak in favour of that motion and two against.

Mr. Bjarme (Sri Lanka): As the country which introduced the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52, on behalf of the States members of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), we wish to register our position on the no-action motion with regard to this amendment.

When the amendment was introduced, we had in mind making draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 more balanced and equitable and acceptable to all countries. We believe that this draft resolution on the subject of nuclear testing starts off well by condemning all nuclear tests, but somewhere in the middle it takes a turn in the wrong direction and becomes specific, by referring to the nuclear tests in South Asia.

We believe that this is not the stage or the occasion to make condemnations or to deplore what took place some months ago. There was an occasion when many countries, including my own, expressed concern over developments that had taken place in our region. Since then there have been improvements, and several developments have taken place. We believe that a draft resolution of this nature will not help the countries of the region to make progress towards nuclear disarmament, especially with the undertakings given on moratoria on further testing and on the two countries concerned joining in the nuclear fissile material cut-off treaty negotiations.

It was with this in mind that Sri Lanka, after consulting with the seven countries of the region, decided that we should make the draft resolution more acceptable by confining it to the objectives concerning nuclear testing and preventing it from moving in a direction that is condemnatory of some actions taking place in the region. We believe that if the draft resolution is to be one of condemnation it should also refer to events that took place even earlier for it to be fair.

The proposed amendments are simple. One is an amendment to the fifth preambular paragraph, recalling all United Nations resolutions on the subject. We believe that singling out one Security Council resolution is not proper, because there have been many resolutions adopted by United Nations bodies, such as the General Assembly and the Conference on Disarmament. We also believe that if we are deploring nuclear tests we should deplore all nuclear tests, not only the tests in South Asia. This would give the draft resolution a balanced focus.

It is for these reasons that Sri Lanka introduced the amendments on behalf of the seven countries of the region. We believe that they will make the draft resolution more acceptable to the international community, and we therefore appeal to all countries in the First Committee to vote against the no-action motion in the name of equity, fair play and objectivity.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would ask delegations to keep to the no-action motion and limit themselves so far as possible to three minutes.

Mr. Pal (India): I have asked for the floor to second the points that have just been very ably made by the representative of Sri Lanka, who opposed Hungary's no-action motion.

In our informal consultations earlier today, we said that we had doubts about the legality of introducing a motion or motions of no action with regard to amendments. Be that as it may, we acknowledge that there is a practice, but what the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 are saying is that they want the Committee to decide on the substance of their draft resolution, but will not permit it to address the substance of any amendments to it. Now, that is not fair and it is not democratic.

As it happens, the three lead sponsors — Australia, Canada and New Zealand — share with India a common parliamentary democratic tradition. All of us got it from the United Kingdom, which preceded us into democracy — and also, of course, into nuclear testing. In other parliamentary practice — and we have this on the highest authority of 18 Indian Members of Parliament who happen to be floating around New York now — it is not the practice to move motions of no action on amendments to a proposal; they can be moved to the entire proposal, but not to amendments. Therefore, what is proposed — certainly by the three lead sponsors — is something that in their own parliamentary practice they would consider undemocratic.

We believe that if indeed the General Assembly, ignoring the precepts of democracy, considers a no-action motion, we should consider when a no-action motion has in practice been permitted to move ahead. It has always been the case that when a draft resolution is put forward that is known to be deeply politically divisive, a motion of no action is proposed so that this political divisiveness is avoided. What we have now is an extraordinary situation in which a deeply divisive, politically motivated draft resolution is submitted and the sponsors are saying, Mr. Chairman, that you should not permit the Committee to take action on any amendment that would reduce the divisiveness and make the draft resolution more balanced. This sets practice, precedent and logic on its head.

It is for this particular reason more than anything else — without addressing myself to the substance — that we would strongly support the Sri Lankan request that the motion of no action be defeated and that the Committee be permitted to pronounce itself democratically on the substance of the Sri Lankan amendment.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I remind speakers that it is within the prerogative of the Chair to request that they limit themselves to three minutes on motions of no action.

Mr. Izquierdo (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to express its support for Hungary's motion of no action with regard to the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52. This position is supported by the terms of the statement made by my delegation at the beginning of this session. We believe that this amendment would alter the essence of the message clearly contained in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mr. Cho (Republic of Korea): My delegation supports the no-action motion of the representative of Hungary on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52.

In our earlier intervention we explained why we support draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 as it stands, without any amendment. Of course, we understand the points raised by our colleague from Sri Lanka when he presented the amendment. We think that if it is put in the context of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, which is before us, it will change the entire spirit and purpose of that draft. This is not acceptable to my delegation.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to the vote on the motion of no action on the draft amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52, as proposed by the representative of Hungary in accordance with rule 116 of the rules of procedure.

Please note carefully that to vote "Yes" means to vote in favour of the no-action motion. To vote "No" means to vote against the no-action motion.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Israel, Panama, Paraguay, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela

The motion of no action on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.52 was carried by 63 votes to 60, with 13 abstentions.

The Chairman: We will now take up the next draft amendment, A/C.1/53/L.55, "India: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Coelho (Portugal): For the reasons stated in the statement made by New Zealand on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, I have the honour to present a motion of no action on document A/C.1/53/L.55.

Mrs. Kunadi (India): India — as I had sought the opportunity to convey earlier, Mr. Chairman — will not be seeking action on that draft amendment or the draft amendment submitted by us in document A/C.1/53/L.57.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The draft amendments in documents A/C.1/53/L.55 and A/C.1/53/L.57 are therefore withdrawn.

We will now take up the draft amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.56, "Pakistan: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Pearson (New Zealand): With respect to document A/C.1/53/L.56, which is an amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, I propose, as provided for in rule 116 of our rules of procedure, a motion of no action. I do so because this amendment serves to divert, if not destroy, the straightforward purpose of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In the opinion of Cuba, the proposed amendments contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56 are directly related to the essence of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing". For that reason, my delegation believes that it is of the utmost importance that all Member States exercise their right to express themselves freely on these proposals.

My delegation strongly objects to the use of procedural manoeuvres, such as the motion of no action that has just been adopted, to prevent delegations from stating their views on very sensitive and substantive issues. For that reason, Cuba will vote against this motion of no action.

Ms. Stener (Norway): My delegation wishes to speak in favour of no action being taken on the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56.

The decisions of India and Pakistan to carry out underground nuclear tests were taken in clear defiance of international norms and constitute a serious threat to the global nuclear non-proliferation regime as well as to peace and stability in the entire region. It is therefore essential that the international community address the issue raised by these tests in an adequate manner during the current session of the General Assembly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 on nuclear testing is an important one and is framed in a focused, credible and balanced way. We believe that it accurately reflects the response of the international community to the testing that took place earlier this year. We would like to see this draft resolution adopted in its present form, without any amendments that would dilute its original purpose.

We cannot accept any change that would make the resolution less focused on this specific issue or that would obscure its message. We need a draft resolution that is straightforward, concise and unambiguous in this respect. We call on all delegations to support a motion for no action on each "L" document containing amendments.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I would like to second the opposition expressed by the representative of Cuba to the no-action motion proposed by New Zealand on document A/C.1/53/L.56.

As I have already explained, draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 should also, apart from expressing its concern about the South Asian testing, since it is entitled "Nuclear testing", express concern about the non-explosive testing that is taking place. That is one of the purposes of document A/C.1/53/L.56.

The second purpose is to call for the withdrawal of coercive and discriminatory measures that are being taken against certain countries. We believe that this is a fair call. We hope that the Committee will be allowed the opportunity to vote on this amendment. We therefore call for opposition to the no-action motion proposed by New Zealand.

Mr. Hoey (Ireland): I wish to second the motion of no action moved by the representative of New Zealand in respect to the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56.

As a sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, my delegation is opposed to amendments aimed at taking the focus away from its very clear message.

The Chairman: I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on the no-action motion proposed by the representative of New Zealand on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56.

A "Yes" vote is a vote in favour of the no-action motion. A "No" vote is a vote against the no-action motion.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Swaziland, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Mozambique, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela

The motion of no action on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.56 was carried by 62 votes to 51, with 18 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): We will now consider the proposed amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.58, "India: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Sadauskas (Lithuania): I move that no action be taken on the draft amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.58.

Mr. Tsering (Bhutan): My delegation would like very briefly to state its opposition to this no-action motion. It will vote against it, and appeals to all other delegations to vote against it.

Mr. Campbell (Australia): For the reasons enunciated by my New Zealand colleague earlier in this debate, Australia supports the proposal just made by our colleague from Lithuania that the Committee take no action on document A/C.1/53/L.58.

Mrs. Kunadi (India): My delegation opposes the no-action motion.

Mr. Izquierdo (Ecuador) (*interpretation from Spanish*): My delegation would like to express its support for Lithuania's no-action motion.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to vote on the no-action motion proposed by Lithuania on the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.58.

A "Yes" vote is a vote in favour of the no-action motion. A "No" vote is a vote against the no-action motion.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Chad, Cuba, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Haiti, Israel, Jamaica, Mexico, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Philippines, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela

The motion of no action on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.58 was carried by 60 votes to 49, with 21 abstentions.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Given the results of the no-action motions on previous amendments, I would not wish to subject the position of my country in the General Assembly to such votes, and therefore, on behalf of India as well as my own delegation, I ask that the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.61 be withdrawn.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): The proposed amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.61 has been withdrawn.

The Committee will now take up the proposed amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L.62, "Nigeria, Zambia and Zimbabwe: amendment to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22".

Mr. Coelho (Portugal): I have the honour to move that, for the reasons given in the statement made by New Zealand on behalf of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, no action be taken on document A/C.1/53/L.62.

Mr. Mapuranga (Zimbabwe): My delegation, along with the other sponsors of document A/C.1/53/L.62, Nigeria and Zambia, will vote against the no-action motion on that document.

My delegation believes that condemning and banning nuclear tests should not be regarded as an end in itself. This view has been articulated clearly by the Organization of African Unity and the Non-Aligned Movement. Our goal should be nuclear disarmament.

I urge the Committee to vote against the no-action motion, and I appeal to those who are habitual abstainers not to abstain this time around, but to vote against the motion.

Mr. Moher (Canada): For the reasons that have been stated frequently here this afternoon, we support the motion of no-action on document A/C.1/53/L.62, and we request the support of all delegations for that purpose.

Mr. Kunda (Zambia): My delegation opposes the no-action motion on document A/C.1/53/L.62 and supports what the Ambassador of Zimbabwe has said. Therefore, my delegation will vote against the motion, as a sponsor of the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.62.

Ms. Stener (Norway): For the reasons outlined by previous speakers, I support Portugal's no-action motion.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee now will proceed to vote on the no-action motion proposed by the representative of Portugal on the amendment in document A/C.1/53/L.62.

A "Yes" vote means a vote in favour of the no-action motion. A "No" vote means a vote against the no-action motion.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Belgium, Bolivia, Bulgaria, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan

Against:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Benin, Bhutan, Brunei Darussalam, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Turkey, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Barbados, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, France, Haiti, Israel, Mexico, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela

The motion of no action on the amendment contained in document A/C.1/53/L/62 was carried by 59 votes to 57, with 17 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of France advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour of the motion.]

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): All the proposed amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 have thus been considered.

We will therefore now proceed to consider draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled

(*spoke in English*)

"Nuclear testing".

(*spoke in French*)

The draft resolution has not been amended.

I first call on those representatives who wish to explain their positions before a decision is taken.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): My delegation deeply regrets that the Committee, through the procedural device of no-action motions, has been prevented from pronouncing itself on the various amendments that have been proposed to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22. It is obvious from the votes that have taken place that this is a divisive and controversial draft resolution, which does not enjoy broad consensus support within the international community.

This draft resolution is discriminatory; it is aimed against my country; and it is unfair. For all the reasons which I have already cited, my delegation will vote against it.

Mr. Benítez Verson (Cuba) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Cuba has had several opportunities in the course of our Committee's work to express its views on the draft resolution on which the Committee is about to take a decision. We made statements in the hope that the sponsors would, in the interests of dealing in depth with the subject of nuclear testing, reach agreement on a text reflecting the legitimate concerns that still exist on this subject.

Cuba's position on nuclear testing is well known. We are opposed to all types of nuclear tests, including so-called laboratory tests and subcritical tests, which contribute to the qualitative development of nuclear weapons.

Without prejudice to our substantive position, our Committee has a duty to act consistently as it tackles the various subjects before it. It must not subject its approach to any selectivity depending on which member States happen to be involved. However, the language used in document A/C.1/53/L.22 is far from reflecting this broad, integrated, balanced approach, which we should take on a subject of such sensitivity.

I would like to take this opportunity to explain the position of my country on the no-action motions moved today. Cuba is not in favour of procedural manoeuvres designed to prevent member States from stating their views on substantive issues related to the very essence of the text under consideration.

Regardless of the final position that my delegation might have adopted on specific amendments, the majority of which are aimed at restoring the balance missing in the present text, we believe that what has happened does not contribute to just and effective solutions. That is why Cuba voted against all the no-action motions.

For these reasons, Cuba will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mrs. Burgois (France) (*interpretation from French*): I should like to clarify a technical point, Mr. Chairman, concerning the voting on the no-action motion on document A/C.1/53/L.62.

If the Committee had not only a legal expert but an expert in magic, I would have asked for the latter's opinion. Failing that, Mr. Chairman, I have to call on your wisdom.

The French delegation voted in favour of the no-action motion. I checked the light on the board, and it was green. Moments later it turned orange. I thought maybe I had become colour blind, and that would not have been surprising, in view of the fatigue brought about by the past few days. But my Austrian colleague also became colour blind —

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): It is an epidemic!

Mrs. Burgois (*interpretation from French*): He too noted that the green light had turned to orange.

In the interests of good order, I shall not try to explain this magical phenomenon, but in the interests of proper recording I repeat that the green button was pressed.

The Chairman (interpretation from French): The statement of the representative of France is noted.

We continue with explanations of vote before the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

Mr. Sorreta (Philippines): The Philippines, early on during our work, expressed its strong support for draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 and will now cast a vote in its favour.

However, in voting in favour of the draft resolution unamended, we want to emphasize that the amendments' not being adopted does not diminish the value the Philippines puts on some of them or the high value we place on some of their principles. We hope that the exercise that we have just gone through will truly show that we oppose all forms of nuclear testing. Hopefully, there will be no similar exercise in the future.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

Mr. Lin Kuo-Chung (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, entitled "Nuclear testing", was introduced by the representative of Canada at the 21st meeting, on 2 November 1998. In addition to the sponsors listed in the draft resolution and in document A/C.1/53/INF/2/Add.3, the draft resolution is sponsored by Uruguay.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea, Guyana,

Haiti, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela

Against:

Benin, Bhutan, India, Pakistan, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Ghana, Israel, Kenya, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Maldives, Morocco, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Qatar, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, Turkey, United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 was adopted by 98 votes to 6, with 31 abstentions.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): I shall now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote on the draft resolution just adopted.

Mr. Oyugi (Kenya): Kenya abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. In brief, we feel that the draft resolution does not take into account amendment proposals, some of which we consider very pertinent to it. The end result, therefore, is that the draft resolution is not as balanced or as fair as we would have liked it to be.

Kenya believes in equity and fair play. In this regard, it is our view that the singling out of States for mention in resolutions goes against that principle. Kenya therefore abstained, just as it did in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.21, which the Committee considered the other day.

This notwithstanding, Kenya remains committed to the ideals inherent in both the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT).

Mrs. Kunadi (India): The Committee has just taken a vote on the draft resolution on nuclear testing, contained in document A/C.1/53/L.22. We regret the procedural tactics that were used to suppress open debate on substantive issues. The draft resolution, drafted in a coercive and discriminatory manner, will not be helpful to the issues at hand or to the objective of promoting nuclear disarmament.

My delegation rejects the premise as well as the content of this draft resolution. It is selective, discriminatory and coercive, and includes aspects which are not relevant to nuclear testing. Isolating India will not be helpful in the process of interaction that my country has embarked upon.

For these reasons, my delegation voted against the draft resolution as a whole.

Mr. Li Changhe (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): In May this year, in the context of the conclusion of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and broad consensus in the international community on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, India blatantly conducted nuclear tests. These flagrantly flouted the non-proliferation regime, which enjoys the universal support of the international community, and dealt a major setback to international arms control and disarmament efforts. Hence, they had a negative impact on peace, stability and security in the region and the world at large. Afterwards another South Asian country was compelled to respond and conducted its nuclear tests. The First Committee, as the forum for the consideration of questions related to disarmament and international security, should logically react to those events.

Draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22 on the whole objectively reflects the views of the international community with regard to the nuclear tests in South Asia. The Chinese delegation voted in favour of it. We also voted in favour of the no-action motions on the amendments, because some of the amendments would fundamentally change the content of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, divert its objective and change its nature. China in essence supports the content of the amendment sponsored by Nigeria, Zimbabwe and Zambia, contained in document A/C.1/53/L.62. However, it should not be added to draft

resolution A/C1./53/L.22, because it could be covered or reflected in other relevant draft resolutions.

Mr. Sungar (Turkey): Since the inception of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), Turkey has been an ardent supporter of it and its full implementation. We have constantly encouraged all countries to accede to it.

Concerning nuclear tests, Turkey signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) on the day it was opened to signature, and has already submitted it to Parliament for ratification. We hope that the international norm that has been set against nuclear testing will become universal. In a number of statements, Turkey has repeatedly voiced its concern about nuclear tests conducted in various parts of the world. However, we have abstained in the past in the voting on draft resolutions regarding nuclear tests, with a view to giving more vigour to the appeal to nuclear-weapon States to make progress towards ending nuclear tests. Consistent with this policy, Turkey abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. Had the amendments been voted upon, my delegation would also have abstained on all of them.

Mr. Shihab (Maldives): My delegation abstained on draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22. The Maldives is firmly opposed to nuclear testing, whatever the time, place or reason. We firmly believe that the principles of non-proliferation, whether vertical or horizontal, must be steadfastly observed. Accordingly, the Maldives fully associates itself with all the relevant provisions of the draft resolution that subscribe to this view. The Maldives also supported previous draft resolutions to come before the Assembly on the issue of nuclear testing. However, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the vote just taken because of the selective, partial and negative direction of certain paragraphs of the draft resolution.

It was for these reasons that my delegation in all sincerity joined its South partners in submitting amendments to the draft resolution to give it a more balanced orientation and to make it consistent with previous practices of the Assembly on nuclear testing. Our abstention should not be construed as condoning nuclear testing in any form, by any party, or for any purpose.

Mr. Rodrigue (Haiti) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, "Nuclear testing", consistent with our position of supporting and encouraging all reasonable initiatives which will help us achieve the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, which constitute the most serious threat to mankind. In the same spirit, we acceded to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and supported its indefinite extension, signed the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty CTBT) and participated in the movements which led to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the legitimacy of the threat or use of nuclear weapons. We welcomed the decision of the Conference on Disarmament to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to negotiate a non-discriminatory, multilateral and internationally effectively verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices.

We therefore share the general concern expressed over the tests carried out by India and Pakistan, tests that not only contributed to increasing regional and global tensions but were also a severe blow to the non-proliferation regime which the international community has tried to establish. Haiti noted with interest that the statements made by these two countries indicate their intention not to carry out any further tests and to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. All these elements are reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22, which the Committee has just adopted. However, my delegation would have preferred it to take into account all types of tests, because, as we are only too well aware, the nuclear-weapon States continue to carry out laboratory tests in order to perfect their existing stocks of nuclear weapons. Such tests should be deplored, for they thwart the objective of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty. These concerns were taken into account in some of the amendments which we presented but which unfortunately were not accepted.

The Chairman (*interpretation from French*): As no other delegation wishes to take the floor, we have concluded our consideration of draft resolution A/C.1/53/L.22.

The meeting rose at 5.45 p.m.